USCG-2004-16860-44

295183

Comment Response Matrix
Gulf Landing Deepwater Port License Application
Draft Environmental Impact Statement

#	Location			Comment	Reviewer	Response
	Page	Line	Section			
General Comments						
1			General Comment	The Draft EIS fails to discuss "surface commingling" issues. Regasified LNG natural gas pipelines are planned to tie into existing pipelines that carry OCS (royalty) production. There are issues in protecting the correlative rights of lessees regarding natural gas and hydrocarbon liquids. There are also allocation and royalty issues. It is recommended that further discussions be held with the GOM Region's Production and Development Office and the USCG/MARAD.	GEdR	
2			General Comment	The figures in the DEIS do not include the lease status of nearby blocks. We realize that the status of leases change; however, depicting the lease status does provide the reader with an opportunity to see how the proposed activities may impact both leased and unleased blocks in the area.	GEdR	
3			General Comment	Mitigative measures are contained in various sections of the DEIS. It is essential that these measures be included as required conditions within the deepwater port license. It is also recommended that the mitigative measures be included in the Record of Decision.	GEdR	
4			General Comment	While reviewing the DEIS, the following deficiency arose from evaluating referenced data. The unidentified magnetic anomaly table found in Appendix B of the *Archaeological and Hazard Survey for EIS for Gulf Landing LLC, Deepwater Port License Application, WC 213,* does not include a column for sensor height off seafloor, as required in NTL 2002-G01. ***This table must be revised to include all the information outlined in NTL 2002-G01, Appendix 2.III.A.***	DB	
5			General Comment	While reviewing the DEIS, the following deficiency arose from evaluating referenced data. There is no indication in the *Archaeological and Hazard Survey for EIS for Gulf Landing LLC, Deepwater Port License Application, WC 213,* of the tow sensor heights for the magnetometer or the sidescan sonar. ***You must provide the sensor tow height for both of these instruments.***	DB	
6			General Comment	While reviewing the DEIS, the following deficiency arose from evaluating referenced data. The sonar image provided for Contact 116 in the *Archaeological, Engineering, and Hazard Survey of 5 proposed pipelines for EIS for Gulf Landing LLC, Deepwater Port License Application, WC 213* is not consistent with the description of this target. ***You must provide a copy of the sidescan sonar record for survey line 118 between shot points 137 and 143 for our review.***	DB	
Specific Comments						
1	ES-5		Noise	Noise impacts would also occur during the decommissioning operations.	GEdR	
2	1-2	29	1.2	Something is missing in this sentence.	GEdR	

Comment Response Matrix
Gulf Landing Deepwater Port License Application
Draft Environmental Impact Statement

#	Location			Comment	Reviewer	Response
	Page	Line	Section			
3	1-5	16	1.3	Though the recommended vessel routes to the proposed terminal are short, the MMS still wants to be actively involved in review of the Port Operations Manual. The MMS' concern is the potential for collisions between LNG carriers and/or support vessels with current or future nearby OCS oil and gas drilling and production structures.	GEdR	
4	2-3	14	2.2	The sentence should include decommissioning activities. It is essential that decommissioning be planned from the initial phases of design and engineering, especially considering the gravity-based structures. This makes the paragraph consistent with the Essential Port Requirements section.	GEdR	
5	2-8	3, 24	2.2.3	We believe the values on lines 3 and 24 should be the same. They refer to the same level of sea water usage for the ORV system – either 126.8 or 136 MGD.	GEdR	
6	2-11	33	2.2.4	Design Number 5 states that 136 MGD of sea water will be used, but in Table 2-2 on page 2-12, the intake of seawater is listed as 127 MGD for Design Number 5. The volume of 136 MGD is also given on page 2-28, line 28, and 136 MGD is given as the average discharge volume on page 4-4, line 33. The average amount of seawater used by the ORV still needs to be consistent, and/or clarified somehow throughout the document.	CC	
7	2-15	7-8	2.2.5	It is essential that the applicant's acknowledgement that finer intake screens could be added later to the intakes, should monitoring warrant their usage. This statement needs to be included as mitigation in the ROD and in the license, if granted.	GEdR	
8	2-16	20-31	2.2.6	The Safety and Security paragraph describes what is required in the Safety Zone surrounding the Gulf Landing LNGC facilities The safety zone is completely encompasses within WC 213. Since WC 213 is an unleased block, how does the proposal affect the availability and desirability of WC 213 for OCS oil and gas leasing? Additionally, the Precautionary Zone extends into five OCS blocks some of which are leased and one of which is producing (since 1969). What activities are being precautioned against? How does that impact existing and potential oil and gas lease holders?	VZ	
9	2-16 and 2-17	32-39 and 1-12	2.2.6	Will there be any new restrictions on current leaseholders? West Cameron blocks 204, 212, and 225 are all currently under lease and all contain portions of the Precautionary Zone. Will there be any new restrictions placed on new leaseholders should West Cameron blocks 213 and/or 224 become leased? Is it suggested that WC block 213 be deferred from OCS oil and gas leasing consideration?	VZ	
10	2-16	49	2.2.6	This would be a good place to discuss the "surface commingling" issues with LNG gas going into pipelines that transport OCS gas.	GEdR	

Comment Response Matrix
Gulf Landing Deepwater Port License Application
Draft Environmental Impact Statement

#	Location			Comment	Reviewer	Response
	Page	Line	Section			
11	2-19		Table 2-4	Add a footnote for the "Acreage of Disturbed Sediment (ac)" so the reader knows the parameters involved and how the calculations were determined.	GEdR	
12	2-19	13-16	2.2.7	Add a narrative "jumper" to the text here that references the reader to Figure 2-9 on Page 2-35.	GEdR	
13	2-20	43	2.2.9	Strike the words, "... nearly ubiquitous ...."	GEdR	
14	2-22	11-13	2.6	As stated in our review for the Interim Draft EIS, comparative information is needed on the alternative terminal site location. The fact that data is used on a nearby block (WC 182) is insufficient to properly characterize the geologic hazards, soil conditions, and potential for cultural resources on WC 183, the alternative site. This is a "major oversight" in the DEIS. Decisionmakers do not have proper nor sufficient information to determine if this alternative is a better selection than the preferred alterative of WC 213.	GEdR	
15	2-24		Figure 2-3	The MMS is very concerned that the proposed anchorages are so close to active pipelines. It is likely that the pipelines have only 3 ft of cover, as required by the MMS at this water depth. In severe weather, a LNG carrier's anchor could be dragged from the proposed anchorages in WC 213 into the nearby pipelines. It is recommended that LNG carriers anchor at the existing anchorage adjacent to the Calcasieu Fairway south of the proposed terminal site (preferred alternative) as shown in Figure 2-2 on page 2-23.	GEdR	
16	2-27	16	2.6.1	The heading "LNGC Unloading" is buried in the text.	GEdR	
17	2-28	28	2.6.1	Intake volumes are again inconsistent in the document. Please decide which volume is correct and do the analyses on that volume.	GEdR	
18	2-30	14	2.6.1	The heading for Personnel Quarters is buried in the text.	GEdR	
19	2-34	17-19	2.6.1	49 CFR 192.327(g) and 192.612(b)(3) do not require a minimum of 36 inches of cover in the water depths in which the five (5) take-away pipelines will be installed. As stated throughout the document, these pipelines will be installed with a minimum of 36 inches of cover which is in accordance with MMS regulations.	TL	
20	2-34		Table 2-5	Add a footnote to explain how the acreage disturbed was calculated or reference the section where the discussion may be found.	GEdR	
21	2-35		Figure 2-9	Please add the existing active pipelines to this figure. As it is now, the proposed take-away pipelines connect to nothing – show the pipelines' connections to the existing pipeline infrastructure.	GEdR	

Comment Response Matrix *Gulf Landing Deepwater Port License Application* *Draft Environmental Impact Statement*						
#	Location			Comment	Reviewer	Response
	Page	Line	Section			
22	2-36 and 2-37	1-17; 14-18	2.6.2	The MMS is particularly concerned about vessel navigation and safety/precautionary zone issues. The MMS respectfully requests to be actively involved in review of the applicant's Engineering and Operations Manuals. Activities described in these manuals may adversely affect OCS blocks (both leased and unleased) and OCS structures/facilities.	GEdR	
23	2-37	1 - 9	2.6.2	The MMS is very concerned about the proximity of the proposed anchorages to several existing OCS pipelines. It is likely that these pipelines are buried only 3 ft below the sea floor. If the proposed anchorage locations are approved, there are several alternatives that might minimize potential impacts to these pipelines. The USCG should consider altering the anchorages size and shape. Certain borders of the anchorages are approximately 184 to 200 meters from two active OCS pipelines. The distance from the anchorages' borders to the pipelines needs to be substantially increased. Secondly, the pipelines could be buried substantially deeper in the sea floor to minimize potential impacts from vessel anchors. If severe weather is forthcoming, LNG carriers could be required to leave these nearby anchorages to also minimize potential conflicts. In summary, a larger margin of safety is needs to minimize the potential for adverse impacts to the pipelines from terminal operations, e.g., a vessel's anchor dragging during severe weather that would snag the pipeline(s).	GEdR	
24	2-37	23	2.6.2	Change "mooring buoy" in this sentence to "GBS."	GEdR	
25	2-37	29	2.6.2	This sentence states that, "The Precautionary Area would have no enforceable restrictions to vessel movements." The Precautionary Area must not restrict OCS mineral exploration, development, production, and transportation activities.	GEdR	
26	2-39	13	2.6.3	49 CFR 192.327(g) and 192.612(b)(3) do not require a minimum of 36 inches of cover in the water depths in which the five (5) take-away pipelines will be installed. As stated throughout the document, these pipelines will be installed with a minimum of 36 inches of cover which is in accordance with MMS regulations.	TL	
27	3-6	13	3.1.3.1	Table 3-1 does not include temperature information from LATEX moorings 18 and 20. Mean and maximum temperatures should be cited at these moorings at any of the three depths for which these are available. They could be included either here or in the text (as was done for NOAA buoy 42035).	CC	
28	3-9	8	3.1.4.1	Velocity means and maxima should be included for mooring 20, if possible. Mooring 21 has excellent velocity data but the water depth of mooring 20 is more comparable to that at the proposed terminal site.	CC	

Comment Response Matrix
Gulf Landing Deepwater Port License Application
Draft Environmental Impact Statement

#	Location			Comment	Reviewer	Response
	Page	Line	Section			
29	3-9	8	3.1.4.1	Direction of flow both for summer and for non-summer should be included. This could be in the form of rosette diagrams as well as mean directions of flow in the table.	CC	
30	3-13	1-13	3.2.2.1	The DEIS needs to mention that oysters are a valuable resource for Shell Keys NWR and Marsh Island State Wildlife Refuge.	JES	
31	3-14	31-32	3.2.2.1	The current description of lagoons is confusing. Re-word the text to clarify that freshwater inflow is low and mixing with Gulf of Mexico waters is restricted.	JES	
32	3-15	1-10	3.2.2.1	Add a sentence to specify the absence of substantial seagrass beds in the region of influence.	JES	
33	3-15	38-45	3.2.2.2	The DEIS needs to include a brief discussion of *Sargassum* as habitat for sea turtles.	JES	
34	3-15	39	3.2.2.2	Capitalize the italicized "*s*".	JES	
35	3-16	3-13	3.2.2.2	Make "Pinnacle Trends" singular: "Pinnacle Trend".	JES	
36	3-16	4	3.2.2.2	The Pinnacle Trend consists of linear features. The term "diameter" is misleading.	JES	
37	3-16	7	3.2.2.2	The reference to "6 to 8 ft" is misleading. The Pinnacle Trend is a system of features with vertical relief of 2-20 m and groups of ridges typically over 1000 m long and 20 m wide. The value of the whole system is greater than the sum of its parts. In this system, features and ridges less than 6-8 ft high contribute substantially to the value of the whole.	JES	
38	3-16	6-8	3.2.2.2	Topographic Features needs to be added as a separate paragraph or discussed more thoroughly in this paragraph and added to the title of this sub-section. It is eluded to here as "topographic highs" but not developed. Perhaps it should go in the "Hard Bottoms" sub-section.	JES	
39	3-41	21-22	3.3.2.3	The text states, "In (sic) is unclear from this report whether the preparers meet the minimum Federal standards for 'archaeologists.'" ***The preparers for this archaeological assessment meet current Federal requirements.***	DB	
40	3-41	29-31 and Table 3-9	3.3.2.3	The text and Table 3-9 identify three lease blocks that require a 50-m survey lane spacing. The only block that requires a 50-m survey interval is WC 167. All other blocks (including EC 64 and EC 65) require a maximum 300-m survey interval	DB	
41	3-42	27	3.3.2.3	Insert the word "deposits" after "archaeological" in this sentence.	DB	

Comment Response Matrix
Gulf Landing Deepwater Port License Application
Draft Environmental Impact Statement

#	Location			Comment	Reviewer	Response
	Page	Line	Section			
42	3-43	12-13	3.3.2.4	Having no hazard or cultural resource surveys on the alternate site location does not fully develop it as a viable alternative.	GEdR	
43	3-48	23-41	3.4.2.2	It is conjecture on the part of the applicant to describe potential geologic conditions within WC 183 since no surveys were conducted on this alternative site location block. The majority of the DEIS' geologic description is based on data from an adjacent block (WC 182).	GEdR	
44	3-49	1-16	3.4.2.2	Since no marine surveys were conducted for the alternative take-away pipeline routes, the MMS is concerned that potential impacts to the environment from the pipelines are not adequately addressed in this alternative section of the DEIS.	GEdR	
45	3-49 and 3-50	41-42 and 1-3	3.4.2.4	We suggest that you avoid using the words "mound" and "topographic high" for the features in this section. These words have been associated with biological communities worthy of protection from offshore exploration and development activities. For example, the words "topographic high" or "topographic feature" has been used to describe the shelf edge banks such as the Flower Garden Banks. The word "mound" has been associated with pinnacle trend features. The "mound" could be described as a shoal or ridge on page 3-49 and the "topographic high" could be described as a shoal or ridge as well.	GEdR	
46	3-50	21-44	3.4.2.5	This section would benefit from a brief discussion on the status of the adjacent blocks/leases to the proposed terminal locations and take-away pipeline routes. Consider referencing the reader to Table 3-14.	GEdR	
47	3-51 thru 3-55		3.4.2.6	Since geophysical surveys were not conducted on the alternate site location and its associated take-away pipelines, data are totally missing for these areas regarding geologic hazards.	GEdR	
48	3-52	37-39	3.4.2.6	Gassy sediment areas were identified by Fugro on of the take-away pipeline routes. Trenching operations in these areas may result in more turbidity in the water column from resuspension of sediments in these less consolidated areas. This type of impact is also likely for areas located in channels where sediments properties may vary (less consolidated) from the adjacent sea floor conditions.	GEdR	
49	3-53	33	3.4.2.6	This line states that, "There was no mention of sediment waves . . ." However, on page 3-46 of the DEIS, "Broad areas of sand waved (WC 177)" was stated in the listing of sea floor features.	GEdR	
50	3-54	6-7	3.4.2.6	All bottom disturbing activities should avoid the boundaries of these channels, not just the bottom-founded construction activities.	GEdR	
51	3-54	27-31	3.4.2.6	The applicant must inform their contractors of the locations of wells and pipelines to ensure their bottom disturbing activities do not impact these entities.	GEdR	
52	3-54 and 3-55		3.4.2.6	Mitigation measures proposed in the DEIS for the magnetic anomalies and sonar contacts must be incorporated in the Record of Decision and in the license to ensure these areas are not impacted.	GEdR	

Comment Response Matrix
Gulf Landing Deepwater Port License Application
Draft Environmental Impact Statement

#	Location			Comment	Reviewer	Response
	Page	Line	Section			
53	3-54	32-39	3.4.2.6	There was a well drilled in West Cameron Block 213 that was plugged and abandoned. The side-scan survey has detected it. What impact does this have on the proposal?	VZ	
54	3-57	24-27	3.5.2.1	Add an introductory discussion to this paragraph that characterizes and explains the grids before you begin to discussion yields within the grids. Also consider moving this paragraph up to follow Table 3-10. The other paragraphs will "flow" better.	GEdR	
55	3-60		Table 3-14	Please update this table for the Final EIS. The status of leases and pipelines is always changing.	GEdR	
56	3-61		3.5.2.5	It is worth noting that a graving dock or similar facility will be required for the GBS construction. This activity will have an effect on the socioeconomic conditions onshore.	GEdR	
57	3-61	8	3.5.2.5	Change the word "tinkering" to "tankering."	GEdR	
58	3-62	12	3.5.2.5	Should the word "Cameron" in this sentence be changed to "Louisiana?" It is unclear whether the comparison is with the state or the city of Cameron.	GEdR	
59	3-69	2-3 and 6-7	3.8.1.1	Delete lines 2 & 3. They are redundant with lines 39 through 41 on page 3-68. Delete lines 6 and 7. They are redundant with lines 4 & 5 on page 3-69.	GEdR	
60	4-1	23	4.1.2	Add the words, "and decommissioning" after the word, "emplacement." This makes the paragraph congruent with the following paragraph.	GEdR	
61	4-3	4	4.1.2.2	The applicant states that the take-away pipelines would be hydrostatically tested using potable water. This conflicts with the using raw sea water as stated in Line 20 on Page 2-39, Line 7 on Page 2-40, and Line 4 on Page 4-4.	TL	
62	4-3	22-23	4.1.2.2	49 CFR 192.327(g) and 192.612(b)(3) do not require a minimum of 36 inches of cover in the water depths in which the five (5) take-away pipelines will be installed. As stated throughout the document, these pipelines will be installed with a minimum of 36 inches of cover which is in accordance with MMS regulations.	TL	
63	4-4	33	4.1.2.4	The average discharge volume is said to be 136 MGD here. However, in Table 2-2 on page 2-12, the intake of seawater is listed as 127 MGD for Design Number 5. The average amount of seawater used by the ORV still needs to be consistent throughout the different chapters in this document, or the apparent discrepancies should be clarified somehow throughout the document.	CC	

Comment Response Matrix
Gulf Landing Deepwater Port License Application
Draft Environmental Impact Statement

#	Location			Comment	Reviewer	Response
	Page	Line	Section			
64	4-5	34	4.1.2.4	The maximum rate of discharge flow is said to be approximately 154.3 MGD here. However, on p. 4-4, line 34, it is said to be 152 MGD. The maximum rate of discharge by the ORV needs to be consistent throughout this and other chapters in this document, or the discrepancies should be clarified somehow.	CC	
65	4-6	8	4.1.2.4	LATEX site 20 is said to be 35 NM west of the proposed terminal site, but this does not agree with the distances of 90 km or 56 mi cited on p. 3-6, line 11. Please check your unit conversions.	CC	
66	4-6	16	4.1.2.4	"In the base case used in the CORMIX model, the seawater flow rate is expected to be 20,000 m^3/hr". Is this the discharge flow rate used? If so, why is such a low value input? Some explanation or justification is needed here.	CC	
67	4-7	10-12	4.1.2.4	Here and in other parts of section 4.1.2.4, figures would be invaluable in explaining general movements of the plume. Please add some figures.	CC	
68	4-7	18	4.1.2.4	Missing words: "Roughly 1.6 percent of ????? the diffuser will...." Refers to time that the water current is parallel to the diffuser, see previous page.	JES	
69	4-7	30	4.1.2.4	"... over a much larger range of depths in the water column". Larger than what? The sentence should explain more completely what is meant here.	CC	
70	4-10	39	4.1.2.4	Change "0.04 parts per trillion (ppt)" to "40 parts per thousand (ppt)", see top of page 4-5.	JES	
71	4-11	14-16	4.1.2.5	The MMS is very concerned about the proximity of the two major pipelines, both of which are still active, and the proposed anchorages for LNGCs. Figure 2-3 shows the edge of the anchorages only 603 to 656 ft from the pipelines. The text states that the anchorages would be used to stage the LNGCs if weather conditions prevented berthing. Our concern is that under severe weather conditions, an anchor might drag in the anchorage and adversely impact the pipelines. It is likely that these pipelines are only buried by 3 ft of cover. Proposed pipelines that transit anchorages require substantially more depth of cover. The MMS is strongly opposed to any activities that have the potential to adversely impact OCS pipelines.	GEdR	
72	4-11	17-19	4.1.2.5	What restrictions are on existing and potential leaseholders of blocks containing portions of the Precautionary Zone since "the Applicant's proposed Anchorage Areas are within the Applicant's proposed Precautionary Area"?	VZ	

Comment Response Matrix
Gulf Landing Deepwater Port License Application
Draft Environmental Impact Statement

#	Location			Comment	Reviewer	Response
	Page	Line	Section			
73	4-13	41	4.1.3	The question marks in this sentence should be deleted and the correct data for the shorter distances for the take-away pipelines emplaced in the text.	GEdR	
74	4-16	16-30	4.2.2.1	Calculations on the quantity of sediments that may be resuspension may be low because the take-away pipeline routes will encounter areas where sediments are less consolidated, e.g., within channels and other softer bottom areas including gassy sediments. More sediment may have to be displaced to achieve the 3 ft of cover required for the pipelines.	GEdR	
75	4-20	27	4.2.2.2	The MMS also has a NTL (NTL 2003-G11) entitled, "Marine Trash and Debris Awareness and Elimination" that is designed to mitigate impacts from these sources. Please consider including a citing to this NTL in the text.	GEdR	
76	4-23	11	4.2.2.2	Remove the word "constant". The cool water discharge plume will be a recurring factor in the marine environment, but it will not be constant. It will be discontinuous, bringing frequent temperature fluctuation to the benthic habitat.	JES	
77	4-26	8	4.2.2.2	Is this what you meant to say?	JES	
78	4-28	30	4.2.2.2	It is suggested that this sentence be rewritten. For example, "Terminal lighting is expected to have negligible effects on marine mammals."	GEdR	
79	4-28	31-32	4.2.2.2	Similar wording should be adopted for this paragraph. , "Presence of the Terminal is expected to have negligible effects on marine mammals."	GEdR	
80	4-31	1-7	4.2.2.2	It is suggested that these topics be rewritten. For example, "Terminal lighting is expected to have negligible effects on sea turtles."	GEdR	
81	4-37	35	4.2.2.2	The SEAMAP data do not include invertebrate information. There are several invertebrates that are commercially very valuable species, especially shrimp and crab. At the terminal's water depth, both shrimp and crab are expected to be present.	GEdR	
82	4-52	9	4.3.2.3	The reference to Appendix No. 3 of NTL No. 2002-G01 should be Appendix 2, section III (there is no Appendix 3 in this NTL).	DB	
83	4-52	15	4.3.2.3	The text states that a 50-m interval survey must be conducted on lease blocks EC 64 and EC 65. The current MMS requirement for these lease blocks is a 300-m maximum survey interval.	DB	
84	4-54	Table 4-8	4.3.2.3	This table needs to be revised to include magnetic anomaly Numbers 141, 148, 157-159, and 168.	DB	
85	4-60		4.5	Please spell out clearly in this section that there will be a supplemental analysis that "may take the form of a separate EIS or other form of NEPA analysis" (as stated on page 2-20, line 11, Section 2.2.8)	KS	
86	4-60		4.5	Please refer to page 2-19 (Section 2.2.8 GBS Fabrication Yard Site Alternatives) in section 4.5. This will inform the reader that a supplemental NEPA document will analyze terminal fabrication.	RC	

Comment Response Matrix
Gulf Landing Deepwater Port License Application
Draft Environmental Impact Statement

#	Location			Comment	Reviewer	Response
	Page	Line	Section			
87	4-62	25-33	4.5.2.3	Should a license be granted for the port and a 500-m safety zone designated, and the block (WC 213) is leased for minerals extraction, an operator would have to directionally drill wells to prospective horizons that might be located near the terminal site. This would be an additional expense to the lessee/operator. We understand that the applicant has tried to locate the terminal site in an area that has a low potential for hydrocarbon accumulations. This may minimize potential conflicts between operators of their respective activities.	GEdR	
88	4-64	3-4	4.5.2.5	The DEIS should state that the applicant will be required to estimate the direct and indirect economic benefits based on the value of the project construction in the supplemental NEPA document that will be prepared for the onshore fabrication/construction site and its associated activities.	GEdR	
89	4-64	5, 13	4.5.2.5	The statement that would be short-term "minor-to-major adverse and beneficial impacts…" tells the reader absolutely nothing. This terminology is too broad to be meaningful. Which impacts are major – the adverse ones? The beneficial ones? Without actually quantifying them, please provide adequate qualitative discussion of the different impact categories and whether the impact is beneficial or adverse.	KS, RC	
90	4-65	26-28	4.5.2.7	It is likely that the onshore fabrication area/graving dock may displace existing land use. Mitigation may be required with this major project area.	GEdR	
91	4-83	31	4.9.4	It is suggested that the word "mud" be changed to "drilling fluid." While the term "mud" is a slang term for "drilling fluid" in the "oil field," many readers may be unaware of this usage and be confused about the type of docks available in Cameron.	GEdR	
92	4-86	30-32	4.10.2	Pool fires represent the greatest concern to the MMS in that current OCS structures, future OCS structures, or MODUs proximal to the terminal could be adversely affected by such events. The nearest structure to the proposed terminal is approximately 3 miles away. It is essential that coordination be conducted between the operator of the terminal and operators of adjacent OCS structures/MODUs.	GEdR	
93	4-78	30-35	4.8.2.6	Please identify the particular control technologies, if any, which would need to be applied to the gas turbines in order for them to comply with the NSPS.	DH	
94	4-79	1-2	4.8.2.7	Please identify the BACT measures that would be implemented.	DH	
95	4-97	2-8	4.10.7.1	The MMS remains very concerned about the establishment of the proposed anchorages near active OCS pipelines. It is essential that the Port Operations Manual contain current information about OCS pipelines, wells, structures, and MODUs in the area of the terminal. It is vitally important that the Ship Master have accurate information for his decisions on anchoring a LNGC near existing infrastructure on the OCS.	GEdR	
96	4-98	28	4.10.8.2	96.5 cm (38 in) should be revised to be 91.4 cm (36 in).	TL	
97	5-1	37-41	5.1	The number of applications for deepwater ports has grown since the interim DEIS was prepared. The status of each project should be included in the FEIS to update this information.	GEdR	

Comment Response Matrix *Gulf Landing Deepwater Port License Application* *Draft Environmental Impact Statement*						
#	Location			Comment	Reviewer	Response
	Page	Line	Section			
98	5-9	31-42	5.1.6	This paragraph discusses transportation, not recreation. I believe that a section title is missing for this paragraph.	GEdR	
99	5-9	36	5.1.6	Replace the number two with the correct number of applications received by the USCG and MARAD.	GEdR	
100	5-10	38-43	5.1.9	Please substantiate the statement: "Implementation of the proposed project would not result in cumulative effects on safety."	VZ	
101	5-11	39	5.2	Please substantiate the statement: "There would be no unavoidable effects on reliability and safety."	VZ	
102	5-13	1-2 and 17-20	5.2	Please give more detail on the possibility of long-term productivity losses.	VZ	

Reviewer: Please provide your name, title, commercial phone number, and date of comments

- *CC – Carole Current, PhD, Physical Oceanographer, MMS, Gulf of Mexico Region-LE (504) 736-3259, carole.current@mms.gov, July 2004*
- *DH – Dirk Herkhof, Meteorologist, MMS Headquarters, (703) 787-1735, dirk.herkhof@mms.gov, July 2004*
- *GEdR – G. Ed Richardson, Senior Environmental Scientist, MMS, Gulf of Mexico-LE, (504) 736-2605 ed.richardson@mms.gov, July 2004.*
- *JES – James E. Sinclair, Marine Biologist, MMS, Gulf of Mexico Region-LE, (504) 736-2789, james.sinclair@mms.gov , July 2004.*
- *KS- Kristen Strellec, MMS, Gulf of Mexico Region-LE (504) 736-2465, Kristen.strellec@mms.gov , July 2004*
- *TL – Timothy Lanigan, Pipeline Engineer, MMS, Gulf of Mexico Region – FO (504) 736-2544, timothy.lanigan@mms.gov , July 2004*
- *RC –Rodney E. Cluck, Sociologist, (703) 787-1087, Rodney.Cluck@mms.gov 29 July 2004.*
- *VZ – Vicki* Zatarain, *Economist, MMS, Gulf of Mexico Region-LE (504) 736-2779, vicki.zatarain@mms.gov, July 2004*